

1
2
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

5 * * *

6 Robert High,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 NDOC, et al.,

10 Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-00847-APG-DJA

Order

11 Before the Court is Plaintiff's "motion requesting permission to amend second amended
12 complaint." (ECF No. 32). Plaintiff's motion does not, however, seek to amend his complaint.
13 Instead, he references the Court's prior order in which it explained that if service could not be
14 accepted for any of the named defendants, Plaintiff could file a motion identifying the unserved
15 defendants and requesting issuance of a summons. Based on that reference, Plaintiff asks to
16 amend his complaint.

17 It is unclear what relief Plaintiff seeks. Plaintiff does not identify any unserved
18 defendants. Nor does he provide any basis for amending his complaint or attach his proposed
19 amendment. Because the Court cannot determine what relief Plaintiff seeks, the Court denies his
20 motion.

21
22 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 32) is **denied**.

23
24 DATED: December 3, 2024

25
26 

27 **DANIEL J. ALBREGTS**
28 **UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**